# The Warlord's Dilemma: Diocletian, Tokugawa Ieyasu, and the Structural Logic of Post-Crisis Stabilization

## A Comparative Study in Elite Power, Institutional Design, and the Limits of Construction

*Thomas J. Bryan, with Claude (Anthropic)*

---

## Introduction: The Same Problem, Twelve Centuries Apart

History rarely repeats, but it rhymes with a regularity that should trouble anyone who believes political outcomes are primarily the product of individual genius or cultural uniqueness. When Gaius Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus seized power in 284 CE after yet another emperor's assassination, he confronted a problem that would have been immediately recognizable to Tokugawa Ieyasu when the latter surveyed the wreckage of sixteenth-century Japan from the battlefield of Sekigahara in 1600: a once-functional political order had collapsed into endemic military competition, central authority had fragmented among regional strongmen, economic systems had been devastated by continuous warfare, and the population — exhausted, displaced, and impoverished — desperately wanted stability but had no reason to trust any single claimant's promise to provide it.

The structural parallels between the Roman Crisis of the Third Century and Japan's Sengoku period are striking enough that Wikipedia's own entry on the Sengoku era lists the Third Century Crisis as a direct analogue. Both were extended periods of political fragmentation lasting roughly fifty to one hundred and fifty years. Both saw the collapse of previously functional governance systems — the Roman Principate and the Ashikaga shogunate respectively — into military anarchy where regional commanders operated as de facto independent rulers. Both witnessed devastating economic consequences: currency debasement and hyperinflation in Rome, agricultural disruption and population displacement in Japan. Both generated intense popular desire for any leader who could credibly promise an end to the chaos. And both ultimately produced stabilizers — Diocletian and Ieyasu — who responded to these structurally identical conditions with remarkably similar institutional solutions.

This study argues that the parallels between Diocletian's reforms and Ieyasu's bakuhan system are not coincidental but reflect the logic of what might be called the warlord's dilemma: when a

military strongman emerges from a period of endemic civil war and seeks to convert temporary battlefield victory into durable political order, the structural constraints of that situation produce a predictable set of institutional responses regardless of cultural context, religious tradition, or geographical setting. Both men constructed new ideological frameworks to replace discredited ones. Both created legal codes designed to regulate potential rivals. Both reorganized administrative structures to balance central control against regional autonomy. Both implemented economic systems designed to extract wealth while preventing rival accumulation. And both, in a gesture that reveals remarkably parallel strategic thinking, voluntarily abdicated from their highest offices to demonstrate that institutional succession could function independent of personal authority.

The divergent outcomes — Diocletian's Tetrarchy collapsing within two years of his abdication while the Tokugawa shogunate endured for over 250 years — raise the central analytical question of this study. If structurally similar conditions produced structurally similar responses, why did one succeed spectacularly and the other fail almost immediately? The answer, this study proposes, lies not in the quality of institutional design or the intelligence of the designers, but in variables that neither man could fully control: the scale and geographical character of the polity being governed, the ethnic and cultural homogeneity of the population, the nature of external threats, and — most critically — whether the ideological framework chosen for legitimation could be appropriated from existing cultural capital or had to be constructed from relatively raw materials.

The Roman case required a second act. What Diocletian began, Constantine completed — not by perfecting Diocletian's constructive approach but by abandoning it in favor of appropriating Christianity, an existing belief system with institutional infrastructure that Diocletian had tried to destroy. The Tokugawa case required no such second act because Ieyasu's construction succeeded on its own terms, sustained by conditions that Rome's vastness, diversity, and exposure to external pressures simply could not replicate.

Understanding why demands examining both cases in detail, beginning with the crisis conditions that made stabilization necessary.

---

# I. Two Warlord Periods: The Structural Anatomy of Political Collapse

The Third Century Crisis and the Sengoku period differ enormously in their particulars — in geography, culture, technology, religion, and the specific mechanics of political competition. Yet beneath these surface differences lies a shared structural anatomy that explains why both crises proved so intractable and why both ultimately produced similar stabilization responses.

The Roman Crisis began in 235 CE with the assassination of Alexander Severus by his own troops and did not end until Diocletian's consolidation of power in 284-285 CE. In those fifty

years, approximately fifty emperors or major claimants held or sought power. The average reign lasted roughly one to two years, and over three-quarters of these men died violently, most murdered by the soldiers who had proclaimed them. The Principate's sophisticated system of constitutional legitimacy, divine sanction, and dynastic succession — the belief infrastructure Augustus had so carefully constructed — lay in ruins. Emperors still received Senate confirmation, but this was meaningless ceremony. The imperial cult continued, but rapid turnover made deification absurd. Constitutional forms persisted as empty shells while actual power flowed exclusively from military force and the capacity to pay troops.

The Sengoku period's origins are conventionally dated to the Ōnin War of 1467, though the roots of instability reached back further into the declining authority of the Ashikaga shogunate. The conflict devastated Kyoto, destroying aristocratic residences, temples, and shrines, and fundamentally undermining whatever residual authority the shoguns possessed. Regional daimyo who had been required to remain in the capital returned to their provinces, where they found their appointed representatives had accumulated independent power. The result was a cascade of territorial warfare that would consume Japan for over a century. The period's signature phenomenon — gekokujō, or "the low overthrowing the high" — saw vassals rebel against lords, retainers seize their masters' domains, and men of common birth rise to military prominence through sheer ability and ruthlessness. The most spectacular example was Toyotomi Hideyoshi, who rose from peasant origins to become Japan's most powerful warlord — a trajectory that would have been structurally identical to that of Maximinus Thrax, the Thracian commoner whose military proclamation as emperor in 235 CE inaugurated Rome's crisis.

The economic consequences in both cases cascaded through every aspect of governance. In Rome, each new emperor needed to pay the troops who proclaimed him, requiring enormous sums immediately. Provincial treasuries were seized, wealthy families were proscribed, temples were looted. When easy targets were exhausted, emperors debased the currency. The denarius fell from roughly ninety-five percent silver under Augustus to five percent under Gallienus by the 260s. Prices increased perhaps twenty to fifty times. The monetary economy collapsed into barter. Long-distance trade networks disintegrated as transaction costs became prohibitive without reliable currency. In Japan, continuous warfare disrupted agricultural production and commercial networks while generating massive population displacement. Traditional authority structures — imperial court, Buddhist monasteries, established warrior families — proved incapable of maintaining effective governance during extended military competition. Farmers faced systematic exploitation by competing armies. Merchants required stable trade conditions that warring daimyo could not provide.

Both crises also produced territorial fragmentation that demonstrated the continued viability of regional governance even as central authority collapsed. The Gallic Empire broke away from Rome between 260 and 274 CE, controlling Gaul, Britain, and Spain under a succession of emperors who actually defended their territories against Germanic invasions. Postumus in Gaul ruled for nine years — longer than almost any emperor during the Crisis — because he used resources to defend the Rhine frontier rather than fight civil wars in Italy. His regime minted better-quality coinage than Rome itself. The Palmyrene Empire under Zenobia similarly

provided protection against Persia that Roman emperors could not. In Japan, powerful daimyo domains like those of the Shimazu in Satsuma, the Mōri in western Honshu, and the Uesugi in the north functioned as effectively independent states with their own legal codes, tax systems, and military establishments. These regional successes proved that governance remained possible — what had failed was specifically the central legitimating framework.

This structural parallel carries a crucial implication: in both cases, the problem was not the absence of administrative capacity or military capability but the absence of legitimacy. Rome possessed every material advantage — sophisticated administration, professional military, legal frameworks, economic integration, engineering capacity, accumulated wealth. Japan's regional domains demonstrated that effective governance was entirely achievable at the local level. What neither polity possessed was a credible framework for explaining why any single claimant deserved authority over the whole. The Principate's constitutional fiction had been exposed as hollow. The Ashikaga shogunate's claims to authority had been rendered meaningless by its manifest inability to govern. In both cases, military force alone proved insufficient to create durable order because military force, without legitimacy, generated only temporary submission that collapsed the moment a rival appeared with comparable strength.

This is the warlord's dilemma in its purest form: battlefield victory can eliminate rivals but cannot create the voluntary compliance necessary for sustainable governance. Every warlord who relies purely on military power faces the same problem that plagued Rome's soldier-emperors — the troops who made him can unmake him the moment someone offers them better pay or better prospects. Converting military dominance into political stability requires something beyond force: it requires belief infrastructure that makes authority seem legitimate rather than merely imposed.

---

## II. The Stabilizers: Parallel Lives, Parallel Solutions

Diocletian and Ieyasu came to power under remarkably similar circumstances, responded with remarkably similar institutional innovations, and even made the same extraordinary personal decision to abdicate — yet produced radically different outcomes. Understanding both the similarities and the divergence requires examining each man's stabilization program in comparative detail.

Both men emerged from the warrior class of their respective societies but were not themselves the most obvious or the most powerful claimants to supreme authority. Diocletian was an Illyrian of obscure origins who had risen through military ranks during the Crisis. He was neither the most distinguished general nor the most politically connected commander when he was acclaimed emperor following the murder of Numerian in 284 CE. His initial hold on power was tenuous — he had to defeat the legitimate emperor Carinus in battle before consolidating control. Ieyasu similarly was not the most powerful daimyo during the Sengoku period's later phases. He had spent decades as a subordinate ally, first of Oda Nobunaga and then of

Toyotomi Hideyoshi. His power base in the Kantō plains, while substantial, was geographically peripheral to the traditional centers of Japanese authority. His victory at Sekigahara in 1600 was not a foregone conclusion — it depended on the defection of key rival commanders during the battle itself. Both men, in other words, achieved power not through overwhelming force but through strategic positioning, patience, and the capacity to present themselves as solutions to systemic governance failure rather than as mere conquerors.

Both men understood immediately that military force alone could not sustain their authority. Diocletian grasped what fifty years of soldier-emperors had demonstrated conclusively: every emperor who relied purely on military power died violently within one to three years. His response was comprehensive institutional redesign. Ieyasu, inheriting the lessons of Nobunaga's assassination and Hideyoshi's failed succession, understood that personal military dominance was inherently temporary. His response was equally comprehensive. The parallels in their institutional programs are extraordinary.

**New Ideological Frameworks.** Both men constructed legitimating ideologies that positioned their authority as cosmic rather than merely political. Diocletian abandoned the Principate's constitutional fiction entirely and created the Dominate — explicit autocracy legitimated through explicit divine claims. He took the title Jovius, associating himself with Jupiter, while his co-emperor Maximian became Herculius, associated with Hercules. These were not conventional divine honors but claims to special divine nature while living. Court ceremonial became elaborate theater: prostration (proskynesis) was required, the emperor wore jeweled robes and a diadem, and physical distance between ruler and ruled was enforced through architectural and ritual staging. The message was clear: the emperor was not a magistrate holding republican offices but a divine representative whose authority derived from cosmic order.

Ieyasu's ideological program was structurally identical in function if different in content. The Tokugawa regime constructed a comprehensive framework combining Neo-Confucian political theory with Japanese cultural traditions. The shogun received authority from the emperor, who possessed divine sanction, creating chains of legitimacy connecting practical governance with cosmic order. Neo-Confucian doctrine provided intellectual justification for hierarchical social organization while presenting elite authority as serving cosmic harmony rather than personal ambition. Opposition to shogunal authority thus became opposition to natural order rather than legitimate political competition — precisely the same rhetorical move Diocletian achieved through divine monarchy. Both men transformed political disobedience into cosmic transgression.

**Legal Codes and Social Regulation.** Both men created comprehensive legal frameworks designed to regulate every aspect of elite behavior. Diocletian's administrative reforms included detailed regulations governing provincial administration, military organization, tax obligations, and economic activity, extending to the remarkable Edict on Maximum Prices that attempted to regulate commercial transactions throughout the empire. Ieyasu's Buke Shohatto (Laws for Military Houses) and related legal codes created systematic frameworks for behavior regulation that went beyond formal criminal law to encompass social interaction, cultural expression,

marriage arrangements, construction activity, and military preparation. Both legal systems served the same dual purpose: embedding ideological principles within legal requirements so that compliance with the new political theory became mandatory rather than voluntary, and creating transparent rules that made elite behavior predictable and monitorable.

**Administrative Reorganization.** Both men reorganized administrative structures to balance central control against regional autonomy while preventing any single subordinate from accumulating sufficient power to challenge central authority. Diocletian roughly doubled the number of provinces from about fifty to nearly one hundred, dividing large provinces into smaller units that were easier to administer and harder for governors to use as bases for rebellion. He separated civil and military authority so that provincial governors no longer commanded troops, removing both the temptation and the capacity for rebellion. He created multiple layers of administrative hierarchy — vicars overseeing groups of provinces, praetorian prefects overseeing vicars — that provided oversight and distributed power.

Ieyasu's bakuhan system achieved the same objectives through different mechanisms adapted to Japanese conditions. Daimyo retained local authority within their domains but accepted systematic limitations on independent action. The classification of daimyo into shinpan (Tokugawa relatives), fudai (hereditary vassals), and tozama (outside lords) created a graded hierarchy that rewarded loyalty while managing threats through differential treatment. Fudai daimyo received preference for important administrative positions while tozama domains faced greater restrictions and surveillance. Strategic redistribution of domains after Sekigahara placed loyal vassals in militarily critical positions while relegating potential rivals to peripheral territories — precisely the same logic Diocletian applied in positioning his tetrarchs and their subordinates.

**Economic Control and Wealth Extraction.** Both men implemented fiscal systems designed to generate sustainable revenue while preventing subordinate wealth accumulation that might fund military challenge. Diocletian's tax reforms introduced periodic assessment of land and population with rates fixed for specific periods, replacing the arbitrary extraction that had characterized the Crisis. Agricultural workers were increasingly tied to the land to prevent tax evasion through migration. The tax burden was heavy but at least predictable. Ieyasu's kokudaka system based taxation on rice production capacity, ensuring consistent revenue for samurai stipends while transferring agricultural risk to farming populations. The sankin-kotai (alternate attendance) requirement created systematic financial drain on daimyo resources through mandatory maintenance of Edo residences, elaborate processions, and ceremonial obligations. Both systems served the same strategic purpose: extracting wealth reliably from productive populations while ensuring that potential rivals spent their surplus on consumption and ceremony rather than military preparation.

**Succession Mechanisms.** Both men designed succession systems intended to prevent the crisis of authority transfer that had destroyed previous regimes. Diocletian's Tetrarchy divided the empire between two senior emperors (Augusti) and two junior emperors (Caesars), with planned abdication after twenty years and orderly promotion of Caesars to Augusti. The system combined merit-based selection with institutional continuity, explicitly rejecting the hereditary principle that had produced incompetent heirs. Ieyasu's approach was different in mechanism

but identical in objective. He established the Tokugawa house as hereditary shoguns while creating institutional checks — the rōjū (council of elders), the wakadoshiyori (junior elders), and various advisory bodies — that could function effectively even under mediocre shoguns. The Tokugawa succession system embraced the hereditary principle that Diocletian rejected, but both systems aimed at the same goal: making authority transfer predictable and institutional rather than violent and personal.

---

## III. The Abdication Gambit: Proving the Institution Outlives the Man

The most striking parallel between Diocletian and Ieyasu — and the one that most forcefully demonstrates the structural logic driving both men's decisions — is that both voluntarily abdicated from their highest offices while retaining real power behind the scenes. This was not coincidence. It was the logical culmination of the same strategic calculation applied to the same structural problem.

The problem was this: any stabilization program built around a single leader's personal authority will collapse when that leader dies or becomes incapacitated. The Third Century Crisis had demonstrated this repeatedly — even effective emperors like Aurelian, who reunified the empire through military genius, were assassinated and succeeded by chaos. Japan's experience was identical: Nobunaga was assassinated, and the political order he had built fragmented immediately. Hideyoshi died of natural causes, and his elaborate succession arrangements for his infant son Hideyori collapsed within two years as Ieyasu and other regents competed for actual power. Personal authority, however impressive, is inherently temporary. Only institutional authority — authority vested in offices and procedures rather than individuals — can outlast the founder.

Both men understood that the ultimate test of institutional design is whether the institution functions when the designer steps back. Diocletian abdicated on May 1, 305 CE, compelling his reluctant co-emperor Maximian to do the same. The Caesars Galerius and Constantius were promoted to Augusti as planned, and new Caesars were appointed. It was the first voluntary imperial abdication in Roman history, and it seemed to validate Diocletian's entire project. The succession mechanism worked exactly as designed — at least initially.

Ieyasu abdicated the office of shogun in 1605, only two years after receiving the appointment, passing the title to his son Hidetada. Like Diocletian, he retained actual power as the retired shogun (ōgosho) operating from Sunpu while his son handled the ceremonial and administrative functions of the office from Edo. The abdication served multiple purposes that Diocletian would have recognized: it demonstrated that the shogunate could survive succession, it established the hereditary principle as functional reality, it freed Ieyasu from ceremonial obligations so he could focus on consolidating the system's institutional foundations, and it made it harder for enemies to target the real center of power.

The parallel extends even to the continuing exercise of power after formal abdication. Diocletian, though retired to his palace at Split on the Dalmatian coast, remained the most authoritative figure in Roman politics. When the Tetrarchy began to fracture, rival claimants sought his endorsement, and he was invited to a conference at Carnuntum in 308 CE to help resolve the succession crisis. He refused to resume the purple, reportedly telling those who urged him to return to power that if they could see the cabbages he had planted with his own hands, they would not ask him to trade that happiness for the storms of imperial politics. Ieyasu similarly operated from retirement with full authority, directing the Siege of Osaka in 1614-1615 that eliminated the last Toyotomi threat, issuing the Christian Expulsion Edict, and continuing to shape the institutional framework that would govern Japan for the next quarter millennium. Both men abdicated in form while retaining power in substance — the point was not to surrender authority but to prove that the institution could accommodate the transfer of titles while real governance continued.

Yet here the parallel reaches its critical divergence. Diocletian's abdication demonstrated that the Tetrarchy could execute a succession — once. Within months, it proved unable to survive the pressures that succession generated. Ieyasu's abdication initiated a succession tradition that would repeat successfully for fifteen generations across 263 years. The same strategic logic, applied to the same structural problem, produced opposite outcomes. Understanding why requires examining the variables that differed between the two cases.

---

# IV. The Geography of Failure: Why Scale Determined Outcomes

The most obvious difference between Rome and Tokugawa Japan was scale, and this difference was not incidental but determinative. The Roman Empire at its height governed roughly fifty million people spread across territories stretching from Britain to Mesopotamia, from the Rhine to the Sahara. It encompassed dozens of distinct ethnic groups, multiple languages, diverse religious traditions, and radically different economic systems. Tokugawa Japan governed roughly twelve to fifteen million people occupying a compact island archipelago with a single dominant ethnic group, a shared language, common cultural traditions, and a relatively homogeneous agricultural economy.

This difference in scale fundamentally shaped the success or failure of each stabilization program in several interlocking ways.

First, scale determined the feasibility of surveillance and control. Ieyasu's sankin-kotai system worked because Japan's geography made it work. The island archipelago had a finite number of daimyo — roughly 260 — whose domains were geographically fixed and whose movements could be monitored with relative ease. The requirement to maintain residences in Edo and leave family members as permanent hostages was enforceable because Edo was accessible from every domain within a matter of weeks, and because Japan's insularity meant that daimyo had

nowhere to flee if they defied the system. The goningumi (five-family groups) system of collective responsibility was effective because villages were small, stable communities where everyone knew everyone else. Information flowed reliably from periphery to center because the distances involved were manageable.

Diocletian faced an entirely different problem. His empire stretched across three continents and required weeks or months of travel between its extremities. No system of alternate attendance or hostage-holding could function across such distances. Provincial governors and military commanders operated with enormous autonomy simply because communications were too slow to allow real-time central direction. The Tetrarchy's division of the empire among four rulers was itself an acknowledgment that no single center of authority could effectively monitor and control such vast territory. But division created its own dangers: each tetrarch commanded armies, controlled revenue, and governed populations large enough to sustain independent political action. The system depended on cooperation among men who had both the means and the opportunity to compete.

Second, scale determined the vulnerability of succession mechanisms to challenge. When Diocletian abdicated, the hereditary principle reasserted itself immediately because there were powerful constituencies — armies accustomed to dynastic loyalty, populations who understood hereditary succession intuitively — spread across territories too vast for any single authority to suppress. Constantine's troops in Britain proclaimed him emperor because they were far enough from the other tetrarchs to act with impunity. Maxentius claimed power in Rome because Rome was far enough from the eastern tetrarchs to resist immediate military response. The empire's sheer size meant that multiple challengers could emerge simultaneously in different regions, each commanding local resources sufficient for military resistance.

Ieyasu's Japan presented no such opportunities. The archipelago's compact geography meant that any daimyo rebellion could be answered by overwhelming central force within weeks. The Tokugawa command of the Kantō plain — Japan's largest and most productive agricultural region — gave the shogunate decisive material advantages over any potential challenger or coalition of challengers. And crucially, Japan had no external frontier from which rival claimants could launch invasions or seek foreign support. The moat of the sea, reinforced by sakoku isolation policy, eliminated the external dimension of political competition that had repeatedly destabilized Rome.

Third, cultural and ethnic homogeneity made ideological construction far more feasible in Japan than in Rome. Ieyasu's Neo-Confucian framework could function as a unifying ideology because it addressed a population that shared language, cultural reference points, and religious traditions. The four-class system (samurai, farmers, artisans, merchants) mapped onto existing social categories that Japanese people recognized and could be explained through cultural narratives that resonated with shared experience. Diocletian's divine monarchy based on Jupiter and Hercules faced an inherently more difficult task: creating ideological unity among Greeks, Egyptians, Syrians, Gauls, Britons, Africans, and dozens of other peoples who worshipped different gods, spoke different languages, and understood political authority through different

cultural frameworks. The Roman Empire's diversity was its strength in many respects, but it was a profound weakness when it came to constructing a single legitimating ideology.

Fourth, external threats operated differently in each case. Rome faced continuous military pressure on multiple frontiers — Sassanid Persia in the east, Germanic tribes along the Rhine and Danube, nomadic peoples on the steppe frontier. These external threats created constant demand for military resources and capable commanders, which in turn created opportunities for usurpation. A successful general defending a frontier could translate military prestige into political claims, as the Crisis had demonstrated repeatedly. The Tetrarchy's military structure was designed partly to address this problem, but it could not eliminate the fundamental dynamic that military necessity created military power centers that might become political rivals.

Japan's island geography eliminated this problem almost entirely. The Tokugawa faced no significant external military threats after the failed Mongol invasions of the thirteenth century. The sakoku policy, initiated in the 1630s, removed even the theoretical possibility of foreign intervention in Japanese politics. With no external military frontier requiring capable commanders with autonomous forces, the Tokugawa could safely demilitarize their society — transforming the samurai from a warrior class into a bureaucratic-administrative class and channeling daimyo resources from military preparation into ceremonial consumption and cultural production. Diocletian could never have done this. The Roman Empire's frontiers demanded constant military readiness, which meant maintaining the very armed forces that could be turned against central authority.

---

## V. The Construction Problem: Why Diocletian Needed a Constantine

The geographical and demographic variables explain why Ieyasu's institutional design succeeded on its own terms while Diocletian's collapsed. But they also illuminate a deeper theoretical point about the nature of legitimacy construction itself.

Ieyasu built his legitimating ideology from materials that already existed in Japanese culture and that resonated with a homogeneous population's shared understanding of social order. Neo-Confucianism was not invented by the Tokugawa — it had been developing in East Asia for centuries and was already familiar to educated Japanese. The hierarchical social order the Tokugawa formalized drew on existing Japanese social categories. The emperor's divine authority was an ancient element of Japanese political culture that Ieyasu appropriated rather than created. Even the practice of shogunal abdication followed established Japanese precedent. In a crucial sense, Ieyasu was not constructing new belief infrastructure so much as systematizing and institutionalizing cultural patterns that already commanded broad acceptance.

Diocletian, by contrast, was genuinely constructing from relatively raw materials. His divine monarchy based on Jupiter and Hercules created new associations rather than capturing

existing ones. His merit-based Tetrarchic succession explicitly rejected the hereditary principle that centuries of monarchical tradition had made intuitively legitimate to Roman populations. His expanded bureaucracy operated efficiently but created no new ideological commitment. His Edict on Maximum Prices attempted to impose economic order by administrative fiat rather than building on existing commercial practices. Each innovation was rational in design but lacked the accumulated cultural authority that belief systems acquire over time.

The critical test came at succession. When Ieyasu abdicated in 1605, his son Hidetada's authority was accepted not because the bakuhan system's institutional design compelled acceptance but because hereditary succession was something Japanese society understood and accepted. The Neo-Confucian framework reinforced this acceptance by providing intellectual justification for what people already believed. The institutional design channeled and formalized existing cultural impulses rather than fighting against them.

When Diocletian abdicated in 305, the Tetrarchic succession mechanism required people to accept something they did not intuitively believe: that merit-based appointment by the senior Augustus should override hereditary claims by emperors' biological sons. Constantine's troops in Britain did not care about the Tetrarchy's elegant institutional design. They cared that Constantine was Constantius's son, and hereditary succession was what they understood. The population of Rome did not care about Galerius's constitutional authority as senior Augustus. They cared that Maxentius was Maximian's son, and sons should inherit their fathers' positions. Diocletian's construction, however rational, competed with the hereditary principle and lost — not because it was poorly designed but because constructed belief systems cannot overcome internalized cultural convictions in a single generation.

This is why Rome required Constantine. Diocletian had demonstrated that belief infrastructure was necessary and that the Crisis could not be solved through military force alone. He had even demonstrated that institutional construction could work during the constructor's lifetime — his twenty-one-year reign was spectacularly successful by the standards of the preceding half-century. But he had also demonstrated, unintentionally, that construction from raw materials faces severe obstacles when competing with existing beliefs. The solution Constantine found was not to perfect Diocletian's constructive approach but to abandon it in favor of appropriation — capturing an existing belief system, Christianity, that already possessed institutional infrastructure, popular support, theological sophistication, and the interpretive class of bishops who could legitimate authority in terms people found meaningful.

Constantine's genius was recognizing what Ieyasu had recognized instinctively: that durable legitimacy comes not from building new ideological systems but from capturing and redirecting existing ones. Ieyasu captured Neo-Confucianism, the imperial institution, and established Japanese social categories. Constantine captured Christianity with its bishops, congregations, theological frameworks, and institutional networks. Both men understood that appropriation is superior to construction because it leverages accumulated cultural capital rather than competing against it.

The difference was that Ieyasu could accomplish both stabilization and ideological appropriation in a single career because Japan's scale and homogeneity made the task manageable for one man's lifetime. Rome's scale and diversity required two careers: Diocletian to demonstrate that institutional redesign was necessary and to build the administrative framework, Constantine to provide the ideological solution that Diocletian's construction could not achieve. The Tokugawa settlement was a one-act play. The Roman settlement required two acts, with Diocletian's necessary failure setting the stage for Constantine's transformative success.

---

## VI. Constantine as Completer: Finishing What Diocletian Started

Viewed through this comparative lens, Constantine appears not as a revolutionary figure who broke with Diocletian's legacy but as its necessary completer — the man who solved the one problem Diocletian had been unable to solve. The administrative innovations Diocletian introduced — the expanded bureaucracy, the separation of civil and military authority, the provincial reorganization, the fiscal reforms, the military restructuring into border troops and mobile field armies — survived Diocletian's abdication and formed the institutional backbone of Constantine's empire. What did not survive was Diocletian's ideological framework and succession mechanism. Constantine kept the institutional architecture and replaced the legitimating software.

The replacement was Christianity, and its advantages over Diocletian's Jupiter-and-Hercules framework were precisely the advantages that any appropriated system holds over a constructed one. Christianity already had institutional infrastructure — bishops governing dioceses that paralleled imperial provincial organization, church councils providing coordinating mechanisms, congregations in every major city creating local communities bound by shared ritual. It already had an interpretive class — educated theologians and clergy who could legitimate authority in sophisticated terms. It already had growing popular acceptance — perhaps ten to fifteen percent of the empire's population, but concentrated in urban centers and including educated elites. It was not tainted by association with the Crisis. And its monotheistic universalism aligned naturally with the political universalism of a single emperor ruling a single empire in a way that polytheistic pluralism never could.

Constantine's Edict of Milan in 313 CE, his convening of the Council of Nicaea in 325, his founding of Constantinople as a Christian capital in 330, and his systematic patronage of the church through construction, legal privileges, and financial support together accomplished what Diocletian's divine monarchy had attempted but failed to achieve: the creation of a self-sustaining belief infrastructure that could survive the founder's death and legitimate his successors. When Constantine died in 337, his sons succeeded through a combination of hereditary right (which people intuitively accepted) and Christian legitimation (which bishops confirmed). The succession was imperfect — there was violence against potential rivals — but it did not produce the immediate systemic collapse that had followed Diocletian's abdication. The

Christian ideological framework proved resilient enough to survive succession crises, military defeats, and even the brief pagan restoration under Julian the Apostate, because it was rooted in existing cultural commitments rather than administrative fiat.

The comparison with Ieyasu is instructive. Ieyasu's Neo-Confucian framework functioned for the Tokugawa shogunate essentially the way Christianity functioned for the late Roman and Byzantine Empires: as a self-sustaining legitimating ideology that operated through voluntary compliance rather than continuous coercion, that provided intellectual justification for hierarchical authority, that created an interpretive class (Confucian scholars in Japan, Christian bishops in Rome) whose institutional interests aligned with supporting the regime, and that embedded political obedience within a larger cosmological framework that made resistance seem not merely illegal but morally wrong.

The key difference was that Ieyasu accomplished in a single step what Rome required in two — the institutional stabilization and the ideological appropriation. This was possible because Japan's conditions permitted it: a compact geography, a homogeneous population, existing cultural materials ready for systematic appropriation, and no external pressures demanding the kind of military readiness that undermined political stability. Rome needed Diocletian first because the administrative and military infrastructure had to be rebuilt before any ideological solution could take hold. And Rome needed Constantine second because the ideological framework Diocletian constructed proved too fragile to survive its creator's departure.

---

## VII. Durability and Its Costs: The Long Shadow of Stabilization

Both stabilization programs — the Tokugawa settlement in its single-act form, and the Diocletian-Constantine settlement in its two-act form — achieved remarkable durability. The Tokugawa shogunate endured from 1603 to 1868, a span of 265 years. The Christian Roman Empire that Constantine established endured in the East as the Byzantine Empire until 1453, over eleven hundred years. These are among the longest-lived political systems in human history, and both owed their durability to the same fundamental achievement: the creation of belief infrastructure that generated voluntary compliance and sustainable resource extraction at a level that pure coercion could never match.

Yet both systems also demonstrated that the mechanisms enabling political stability can become obstacles to adaptation when circumstances change. The Tokugawa system's rigid class structure, isolationist policy, and restrictions on technological development maintained political order for over two centuries but prevented the capital accumulation, industrial development, and military modernization that became necessary for international competitiveness after Commodore Perry's arrival in 1853. The very institutions that had sustained stability — the bakuhan system's checks on daimyo power, the sakoku policy's elimination of foreign influence, the Neo-Confucian ideology's emphasis on hierarchy and

tradition — became liabilities when the international environment demanded rapid adaptation. The Meiji Restoration of 1868 represented not a popular revolution but an elite coalition realignment: lower-ranking samurai allied with tozama daimyo to overthrow the Tokugawa while preserving warrior class privileges, using the emperor as a symbol of legitimacy for modernization.

The Byzantine Empire demonstrated analogous rigidities over a longer timeframe, though its continuous exposure to external military pressure forced more ongoing adaptation than the Tokugawa system required. The Christian belief infrastructure that sustained Byzantine authority also constrained it — theological controversies consumed enormous political energy, church-state conflicts periodically destabilized governance, and the ideological framework that made the emperor God's representative on earth also made religious innovation politically dangerous. Yet the Byzantine Empire's capacity to survive military catastrophes that would have destroyed states without robust belief infrastructure — the loss of two-thirds of its territory to Arab conquests in the seventh century, the iconoclast controversy, the Fourth Crusade's sack of Constantinople in 1204 — demonstrated that the legitimacy framework Constantine created possessed a resilience that purely institutional or military systems could not match.

---

## VIII. Theoretical Implications: Human Agency Within Structural Constraints

The comparison between Diocletian, Ieyasu, and Constantine illuminates a fundamental tension in historical analysis between structural determinism and individual agency. The structural conditions both stabilizers faced were remarkably similar, and the institutional responses they generated were remarkably parallel. This suggests that structural constraints powerfully shape the range of available solutions to governance problems, producing convergent responses across radically different cultural contexts. A warlord emerging from a period of endemic civil war and seeking to convert military victory into durable political order will, regardless of whether he operates in third-century Rome or sixteenth-century Japan, construct legitimating ideologies, create legal codes to regulate potential rivals, reorganize administration to balance central control and regional autonomy, implement fiscal systems to extract wealth while preventing rival accumulation, and attempt to establish institutional succession mechanisms.

Yet within these structural constraints, individual choices mattered enormously. Diocletian chose to construct new ideological frameworks rather than appropriate existing ones — specifically, he chose to persecute Christianity rather than co-opt it. Had he made the opposite choice, the two-act Roman drama might have been compressed into one. Constantine chose to appropriate Christianity rather than attempt a different construction — a choice that shaped Western civilization for two millennia. Ieyasu chose to embrace the hereditary principle rather than fight it — working with the cultural grain rather than against it, as Diocletian had tried to do. These were genuine choices, not structurally determined outcomes, and they produced dramatically different consequences.

The most productive framework for understanding these cases is one that treats structure as defining the problem space and constraining the solution set while recognizing that individuals navigate that space through choices whose consequences are not structurally predetermined. Diocletian and Ieyasu faced the same problem. They generated similar solutions. But the specific content of those solutions — which ideology, which succession principle, which approach to external relations — reflected individual judgment operating within structural constraints. The outcomes depended on the interaction between structural conditions (scale, geography, cultural homogeneity, external threats) and individual choices (construction versus appropriation, merit versus heredity, engagement versus isolation).

This framework suggests that history is neither the product of great men imposing their will on passive circumstances nor the mechanical unfolding of structural forces that individuals merely enact. It is the product of intelligent agents making consequential choices within structural conditions they did not create and cannot fully control. Diocletian was not a lesser strategist than Ieyasu — he may well have been a greater one, given the vastly more complex environment he faced. But the structural conditions of the Roman Empire made his constructive approach insufficient in ways that Japan's conditions did not impose on Ieyasu. Constantine was not more intelligent than Diocletian — but he inherited both Diocletian's institutional achievements and the lesson of his ideological failure, and he had the strategic clarity to draw the right conclusion: appropriate, do not construct.

The warlord's dilemma, it turns out, has a consistent answer across civilizations: build institutions to channel power, appropriate ideology to legitimate it, and work with the cultural grain rather than against it. When structural conditions permit all three simultaneously, as they did for Ieyasu, stability can be achieved in a single career. When they do not, as in Rome's case, the work may require generations — and the willingness to learn from failure.

---

# Bibliography

## Primary Sources

*Buke Shohatto* (Laws for Military Houses). 1615, revised 1635, 1663.

Arai Hakuseki. *Oritaku Shiba no Ki* (Told Round a Brushwood Fire). c. 1716.

Lactantius. *On the Deaths of the Persecutors*. Translated by J.L. Creed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *The Life of the Blessed Emperor Constantine*. Translated by Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by G.A. Williamson. Revised by Andrew Louth. London: Penguin, 1989.

Zosimus. *New History*. Translated by Ronald T. Ridley. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1982.

Codex Theodosianus (Theodosian Code). Translated by Clyde Pharr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Yamaga Soko. *Bukyo Yoroku* (Essential Teachings of the Military Way). 1656.

## Secondary Sources: Roman Empire

Barnes, Timothy D. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Barnes, Timothy D. *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Drake, H.A. *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Lenski, Noel, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*. Revised edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Potter, David S. *The Roman Empire at Bay, AD 180-395*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2014.

Rees, Roger. *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Williams, Stephen. *Diocletian and the Roman Recovery*. London: Routledge, 1997.

## Secondary Sources: Tokugawa Japan

Totman, Conrad. *Politics in the Tokugawa Bakufu, 1600-1843*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Hall, John Whitney. "The Bakuhan System." In *The Cambridge History of Japan, Volume 4: Early Modern Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Bolitho, Harold. *Treasures Among Men: The Fudai Daimyo in Tokugawa Japan*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Ooms, Herman. *Tokugawa Ideology: Early Constructs, 1570-1680*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Ikegami, Eiko. *The Taming of the Samurai*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Smith, Thomas C. *The Agrarian Origins of Modern Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

## Comparative and Theoretical

Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power*. Vol. 1, *A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Bryan, Thomas J. *Analytical Framework for Elite Power and Belief Systems*. Version 3.0. Unpublished manuscript, 2025.

---

**Copyright and Licensing**

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

This case study is part of the *Elite Power and Belief Systems* research series.